CONFIDENTIAL

Newsweek

1750 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 • SUITE 1220 • (202) 298-7880

june 5, 1975

jesus, policoff, i said merely i was weary of being badgered by dilettantes (three Ts), not that i had a contract out on you.

i'm quite familiar with your work and it is commendable. there are some errors threaded through it which is par for the course for any document so intense. forgive me if i put them down to oversight, innocence or over-familiarity with your research, rather than that you are part of the secret cabal working to destroy western civilization.

so, for christ sake, credit me with not trying to deceive those decent enough to put down 50 cents for my magazine expecting to find that lindsay gave them a stab at the truth here and there.

one of the things that weary me about the conspiratorialists-- and that plays into the hands of the nay-sayers , is the insistence upon setting the ground rules for the work of others, then, when others don't play their game it is not that they are bad sports but rather part of the fucking conspiracy.

i wasnot, as you insist i must be, "examining " the warren commission report. that has been examined, re-examined and cross-examined for more than a decade. i was merely sifting through and updating the " new evidence" that challenges the warren commission. so it made no difference that a former member of the warren commission staff handed me at my request a rather interesting analysis prepared by one not remotely connected withthe commission's work that had been put together, as it is clearly shown in the body of the report, at the request of the former staff member. it is an interesting viewpoint and it happened to be the onlycopy i could lay my hands on. we did not chisel the findings into stone tablets. we threw it out for comment and study. it had not, to my knowledge previously surfaced. i am told that anti-warren commentators are having similar studies done. splendid.no skinoff my face. hope it continues the controversy.

i am sorry as hell i cannot agree that theories as bizarre and elusive of proof as those spun by groden, josiah thompson and others are more valid than the findings of the warren commission. i have apologized to groden that i cannot see his elusive assassin hiding, rifle at the ready, in the bushes on the grassy knoll. that pains me, but i frankly cannot find them there.

mark lane had a few of us in two weeks ago to show the ubiquitous zapruder film again. he concentrated on the moment the president was hit by the fatal bullet. " see, the president's body moves backward, not forward" he repeated again and again. sorry, but the president's body clearly moves forward first-- and the gush of the detritus of a shattered skull and spongy brain is forward, spattering those in front--the connallys, secret service agents, the seats, floor and dash board, with bloody brain tissue. i'm sorry. that is the way i have seen it from the first and that is the way i see it now, supported by allthe physical evidence.

nor do i believe, as you charge, that doctor james humes destroyed "the first draft of the autopsy," for , as you probably know by now, there was no first draft. he destroyed his bloody , messy handwritten notes-- after he had transcribed them into a dictating machine. he should not have done that but he did and i find it not the least difficult to take the word of a man against whom no previous suspicions of incomptence had been leveled, and who has since distinguished himself as a physician-- despite a bastinado of allegations, unsupported, that might have wrecked a lesser man. i merely conclude the charges stem from men lesser than humes-- until shown otherwise.

now, right in the middle of all this, you call and when i ask you to name one person who has challenged the location of the bullet wound in kennedy's upper back or neck, as the case may be, you fumble around and then give me-- harold weisberg. doctor harold weisberg, md., fascp, the honorary pathologist? no, weisberg the maryland chicken farmer.

now come off it, policoff. you yourself have gone on and on about officialdom allowing the perfectly respectable dr. john k. lattimer, chairman of the department of urology at columbia university's college of physicians and surgeons, to see the autopsy evidence and pass judgment on it. why a urologist? i believe you asked. why a chicken farmer?

let us criticise officials for allowing a urologist to invade areas in which forensic pathologists fear to tread, and honor harold weisberg for his persistence and patience in using the freedom of information law to force disclosure of heretofore hidden evidence. but don't give me weisberg on the wounds, and i won't argue with you that a urologist however respectable and competent, was not the man for the hour. okay?

Newsweek

1750 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 • SUITE 1220 • (202) 298-7680

there are other things i might discuss but it would be fruitless because you are obviously convinced i am part of some secret cabal-- bradlee, salisbury and lindsay, was the way you put it..to keep the truth from surfacing. you flatter me placing me in that distinguished company. but we have little in common. we,all three, i am sure, play our time on the stage with different degrees of visibility, talent and responsibility. scarcely the material for a cabal to suppress truth.

let me put it this way: if there was a chance to blow the findings of the warren commission from here to pluto and get my name in the history books as the news correspondent who did it, would it not seem reasonable to you that i might be interested? there is simply no drama or courage involved in " defending",as you put it, a document so savagely attacked and examined as the warren commission report for eleven years. by your own estimate, it " stinks."

I have heard all the arguments, policoff. i have seen and examined all the theories said to negate the warren report. what i have not seen-- and i mean this quite sincerely, is a cohesive theory that makes more--or in many cases as much--sense than the warren report and is more easily proved.

let us take one rather obscure area of controversy, the shadow or flattened object observed in photos of kennedy's brain.

wecht posits a fragment of the missile that killed kennedy or " a brain tumor."

i have discussed this with established neuro-surgeons who insist that it cannot be a brain tumor for two reasons: it is darkened with blood and unless the blood drainedinto thetumor it would not show up on the plate. none of three surgeons ,with whom i discussed this phenomenon ever encountered a brain tumor containing enough blood to create that kind of shadow. what is more important, they simply explode when, given the description of the " geometric " outlines described by wecht and others, they hear presumably qualified physicians referring even to the possibility that any shadow with such sharp angles could be a tumor.

my educated guess is this: it is a total misreading of a common phenomenon. the president's brain was so torn up on the right side that what wecht saw was really the outline of the shattered brain against the board on which it rests. inother words, he is looking " through" the brain, not at it.

~~the photographs might help if more~~

it might help if more qualified doctors viewed the photos and x-rays. but that won't settle the question.

it would, presumably, be decisive if the formalin set brain were produced for examination. but do you really believe it? how long do youthink it would be before somebody wrote a piece saying there is no proof it was jfk's brain? i think you know the drill. it would be traced from the autopsy amphitheater at besthesda naval hospital to admiral burkely's office, to robert kennedy, where the trail got cold. then it would be postulated that somewhere along the line the brain was lost and --- well, why go on.

right now i am busy with the rockefeller cia probe and report-- and the conflict developing with senator church.

but if you are in town on jfk business in the future, give me a call and drop by. i'm trying to quit smoking so i should be through the acute withdrawal stage in another couple of weeks. i am bearable under normal circumstances, hopeless under these.

but we don't have to move along parallel lines snarling at each other, policoff. we may each of us, have something to interest the other.

i suggest a quick relaxing exercise picture paul muni playing harold weisberg at the crucial moment weisberg, peering through his electronic microscope, discovers that kennedy's brain contains particles of a metal of extra-terrestial origin. a cry passes his lips as he turns to share his triumph. all thechickens can do is cock heads and go cluck. cleeooucckkk, cluck. a hell of a scene.

peace, policoff, it is not us; it is the rest of them.

Lindsay